UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/600,014	06/20/2003	Avijit Chatterjee	ROC920030209US1	8483

46797　　7590　　03/28/2007		EXAMINER	
IBM CORPORATION, INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW		LIN, SHEW FEN	
DEPT 917, BLDG. 006-1			
3605 HIGHWAY 52 NORTH		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
ROCHESTER, MN 55901-7829		2166	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/28/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 10/06)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>17 January 2007</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-4 12-24, and 26-28</u> is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-4, 12-24 and 26-28</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

    1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

    2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

    3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

a. This action is taken to response to amendments and remarks filed on 12/18/2006

    and request for continued examination (RCE) filed on 1/17/2007.

b. Claims 1-4, 12-24, and 26-28 are pending in this Office Action. Claims 1, 12, 18,

    and 21 are independent claims.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR

1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for

continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been

timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR

1.114. Applicant's submission filed on January 17, 2007 has been entered.

Terminal Disclaimer

The terminal disclaimer filed on 12/18/2006 disclaiming the terminal portion of any

patent granted on this application, which would extend beyond the expiration date of co-pending

application 10/600,021 has been reviewed and is accepted. The terminal disclaimer has been

recorded.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the
subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite

for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant

regards as the invention.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "the one or more annotatable data objects points ". There

is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 12 recites the limitation "the set of identifying parameters ", "the one or more

identifying parameters". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed
in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for
patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an
international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this
subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United
States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 12-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Gupta et al.

(US Patent 6,956,593, hereinafter "Gupta").

As to claim 12, Gupta discloses a method of creating annotations for a plurality of

different type data objects manipulated by a plurality of applications (abstract, column 1, lines

66-67), comprising:

receiving a request from one of the applications to create an annotation for a data object, wherein the data object is identified by a set of parameters (Figures 5-7, column 9, lines 26-34, column 11, lines 36-51, column 12, lines 56-59);

selecting an annotation structure from a set of annotation structures, each annotation structure defining one or more annotation fields (Figures 7-11, column 12, lines 44-46), wherein the selection is based, at least in part, on the set of identifying parameters identifying the data object to be annotated (Figure 7, column 11, lines 45-51, column 12, lines 60-64, column 13, lines 11-32);

generating a graphical user interface allowing entry of the one or more annotation fields (Figures 8-10, column 14, lines 58-65, column 15, lines 10-33);

creating an index based on the one or more identifying parameters (unique annotation identifier, Figure 4, item 194, column 9, lines 1-2); and

creating an annotation record comprising the index and information entered, via the graphical user interface, for the one or more annotation fields (add annotation record through GUI, Figures 8-10, column 12, lines 56-59, column 14, lines 40-48).

As to claim 13, Gupta discloses further comprising storing the annotation record in an annotation store separate from the annotated data object (store in annotation meta store, Figures 1 and 3, column 7, lines 28-39).

As to claim 14, Gupta discloses wherein selecting the annotation structure comprises:

presenting, to a user, a plurality of annotation structures associated with the data object

(Figures 7-11, column 12, lines 44-46); and

receiving, from the user, a selection of one of the plurality of annotation structures

(column 15, lines 13-24).

As to claim 15, Gupta discloses further comprising receiving, from the user, a selected

role in which the user has chosen to act (selection of annotation set to act, column 12, lines 65-

67, column 13, lines 1-10).

As to claim 16, Gupta discloses wherein the plurality of annotation structures presented

to the user is dependent on the selected role (read/write access control, column 9, lines 15-25,

column 13, lines 1-10, column 16, lines 1-6).

As to claim 17, Gupta discloses further comprising generating a graphical user interface

for displaying the annotation information, wherein the annotation information presented to the

user in the graphical user interface is dependent on the selected role (Figure 12, column 16, lines

1-6).

As to claim 18, refer to "As to claim 12" and "As to claim 13" presented earlier in this

Office Action.

As to claim 19, Gupta discloses wherein receiving a request from one of the applications

to create an annotation for à data object comprises receiving the request from a plug-in

annotation component (incorporated into the web browser, operating system, column 12, lines 3-

13).

As to claim 20, Gupta discloses wherein selection of the annotation structure is based, at

least in part, on one or more user credentials (read/write access control, column 9, lines 15-25,

column 13, lines 1-10, column 16, lines 1-6).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the

claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various

claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any

evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out

the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later

invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c)

and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-4, 21-24, and 26-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Altman (US Pub 2004/0163042) in view of ESP (Electrical Schematics Page, April 25,

2002, http://www.jlab.org/accel/inj_group/elec1.htm).

As to claim 1, Altman discloses a method for exchanging information between entities

on a network comprising:

installing an annotation management system on the network (paragraph [0038], lines 3-5,

paragraph [0041], lines 17-19);

identifying a plurality of annotatable data objects (documents to be annotated, paragraph

[0003]) manipulated by a plurality of applications on the network (web browser, lotus note,

acrobat, Figure 5, paragraph [0041]), wherein the plurality of annotatable data objects comprise

at least one of electrical schematics and mechanical schematics; and

providing, via the annotation management system (annotation plug-in, paragraph [0041],

lines 6-11), one or more interfaces for manipulating annotations for the annotatable data objects

(create/modify through GUI, Figures 4A-C, paragraph [0040], 3-6, paragraph [0041], lines 6-11,

paragraph [0043], lines 11-14), a set of annotation structures each defining a set of annotation

fields (Figure 13A, paragraph [0042], [0043]), and an annotation server configured to receive

requests to access annotations for one or more of the annotatable data objects issued by at least

one of the plurality of applications on the network (paragraph [0046]-[0047])), wherein, the

annotation server is further configured to generate, based on an annotation structure associated

with the one or more annotatable data objects points, the one or more interfaces for creating or

viewing annotations (Figures 8A, 9A/B, paragraph [0051], [0054]).

Altman discloses that annotatable data objects can be a blueprint for architect or

professional engineer (paragraph [0048]) and does not explicitly disclose wherein the pluralities

of annotatable data objects comprise at least one of electrical schematics and mechanical

schematics.

ESP discloses annotatable data objects of electrical schematics in an Acrobat PDF format

(page 1).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention

was made to combine Altman and ESP teaching to annotate electrical schematics for the purpose

of documenting the modification and approval relating to the schematic diagrams. The skilled

artisan would have been motivated to improve the invention of Altman per the above by adding

annotation on electrical schematics diagrams such that workflow message can be generated and

reviewed (Abstract, Altman).

As to claim 2, Altman discloses wherein providing one or more interfaces comprises

providing at least one interface for creating annotations (Figures 9A, 9B, paragraph [0054]) and

at least one interface for viewing annotations (paragraph [0047]).

As to claim 3, Altman discloses wherein the one or more interfaces comprise at least one

graphical user interface (Figure 9B, paragraph [0047]).

As to claim 4, Altman discloses wherein the at least one graphical user interface is

accessible from within one or more of the applications (web browser, paragraph [0041], lines -

11).

As to claim 21, Altman discloses a system for managing annotations for one or more

different type data sources manipulated by a plurality of different type applications, comprising:

an annotation database for storing annotations separately from the data sources

associated with the annotations (Abstract, Figures 3B, 4A, 4B, 4C, paragraph [0040], lines 3-6),

wherein the one or more different type data sources comprise at least one of electrical schematics

and mechanical schematics;

a set of annotatable data object points defining portions of the data sources associated

with the annotations described by the associated annotations (Figure 6, paragraph [0042]);

a set of annotation structures, each defining a set of annotation fields (Figure 13A,

paragraph [0042], [0043]);

a set of plug-in components, each for interfacing between one or more applications and

an annotation server (paragraph [0041]); and

an annotation server (annotation repository, abstract) configured to receive, via the plug-

in components (annotation manager, paragraph [0041], lines 13-16), requests to access

annotations for one or more of the annotatable data object points issued by the one or more of the

applications running on the client computer (paragraph[0046]-[0047]) and generate a graphical

user interface screen, based on an annotation structure associated with the one or more of the

annotatable data object points, for creating or viewing annotations for the one or more

annotatable data object points (Figures 8A, 9A/B, paragraph [0051], [0054]).

Altman discloses that annotatable data objects can be a blueprint for architect or

professional engineer (paragraph [0048]) does not explicitly disclose wherein the one or more

different type data sources comprise at least one of electrical schematics and mechanical

schematics.

ESP discloses annotatable data source of electrical schematics in an Acrobat PDF format

(page 1).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention

was made to combine Altman and ESP teaching to annotate electrical schematics for the purpose

of documenting the modification and approval relating to the schematic diagrams. The skilled

artisan would have been motivated to improve the invention of Altman per the above by adding

annotation on electrical schematics diagrams such that workflow message can be generated and

reviewed (Abstract, Altman).

As to claim 22, Altman discloses wherein the one or more different type data sources

comprise at least text documents and database tables (paragraph [0009]).

As to claim 23, Altman discloses wherein the annotatable data object points comprise at

least one or more database cells, and one or more portions of text documents (Figure 6,

paragraph [0042]).

As to claim 24, Altman discloses wherein the one or more different type data sources

further comprise at least multimedia files (combination of images and text, paragraph [0003],

line 4) and the annotatable data object points comprise at least an image (paragraph [0043], lines

1-7).

As to claim 26, Altman discloses wherein the annotation server is configured to create

annotations with no direct association to any of the annotatable data object points (paragraph

[0043], lines 7-14).

As to claim 27, Altman discloses wherein the annotation server is configured to create

annotations associated with more than one of the data sources (scanned image, computer

generated files, database, paragraph [0009]).

As to claim 28, Altman discloses wherein the annotation server is configured to create

more than one annotation for a single annotatable data point (multiple reviews, Figure 8A,

paragraph [0051]).

Response to Amendment and Remarks

Applicant's amendments and remarks have been fully and carefully considered. In

response to these amendments, another iteration of claim analysis, based on previously relied on

references, and particularly addressing the newly amended limitation, has been made. Refer to

the corresponding sections of the claim analysis for details.

Response to remarks on 35 U.S.C. § 102 rejections

Applicant contends that Gupta does not teach, "a set of annotation structures, each

annotation structure defining one or more annotation fields.". The Examiner respectfully

disagrees. Gupta clearly teaches "a set of annotation structures, each annotation structure

defining one or more annotation fields" see shown in Figures 7-11 that different annotation

structure are used to add annotations. Furthermore, as shown in the Figures, each annotation

structure defines a set of annotation fields (for example, Figure 7, items 284, 286,..).

Response to remarks on 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejections

Applicant contends that Gupta (Altman) does not teach, "set of annotation structures,

each defining a set of annotation fields.". The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Altman clearly

teaches "a set of annotation structures, each annotation structure defining one or more annotation

fields" as described in paragraph [0042] that annotations may contain x-pos and y-pos fields,

respectively (see also Figure 6). In an alternate case, annotation may contain an additional

coordinate pair (x_extent, y_extent) that specifies the bounds of where the annotation is

displayed. Furthermore, as shown in the Figure13A, each annotation structure defines a set of

annotation fields. For example, the annotation can be inserted either using "draw a rectangle",

"highlight text or graphics" or "strikeout text or graphics" (see Figure 9A, paragraph [0054]).

Related Prior Arts

The following list of prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Gantt; Brian D., US 6573903 B2, "Determining and displaying geometric relationships between objects in a computer-implemented graphics system".

- Bays; Alan Ronald et al., US 6519603 B1, "Method and system for organizing an annotation structure and for querying data and annotations".

- Eintracht; Zvika et al., US 6687878 B1, "Synchronizing/updating local client notes with annotations previously made by other clients in a notes database".

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shew-Fen Lin whose telephone number is 571-272-2672. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM - 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain Alam can be reached on 571-272-3978. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SFL
Shew-Fen Lin   Art Unit 2166
Patent Examiner   March 21, 2007

HOSAIN ALAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER